## EXHIBIT 6

```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
 2
                            SOUTHERN DIVISION
 3
 4
     IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS
 5
     ANTITRUST LITIGATION
                                          MDL NO. 2311
 6
 7
                   STATUS CONFERENCE / MOTION HEARING
 8
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARIANNE O. BATTANI
 9
                       United States District Judge
                 Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
10
                       231 West Lafayette Boulevard
                           Detroit, Michigan
11
                       Wednesday, November 13, 2013
12
     APPEARANCES:
13
     Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:
14
                       ROBERT W. BOSSLET, III
15
                       KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN, L.L.P.
                       1633 Broadway
16
                       New York, NY 10019
                       (212) 506-1868
17
                       THOMAS C. BRIGHT
18
                       GOLD, BENNET, CERA & SIDENER, L.L.P.
                       595 Market Street , Suite 2300
19
                       San Francisco, CA
                                           94105
                       (415) 777-2230
20
                       WILLIAM G. CALDES
21
                       SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.
                       1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
22
                       Philadelphia, PA 19103
                       (215) 496-0300
23
24
25
```

ACAPs and the plaintiffs in wire harness.

Paragraph 112 of wire harness, defendants' pricing actions regarding their sales of wire harness products to automobile manufacturers had an impact on prices for wire harness products for all direct purchasers of wire harness products throughout the United States, and that's the -- those are the allegations which Your Honor upheld in the pages that I cited to the Court earlier.

Paragraph 69 of the ACAP complaint, we allege the winning price is also used when the OEM suppliers that were not part of RFQ process purchased, so that is another fact. Defendants may dispute it, they may say that price doesn't take effect until some years later, we say it is the price that is used.

I stood before Your Honor in the wire harness argument, I posited the hypothetical of the beverage distributors, the bottled water, the soda distributors, if they had a bid-rigging scheme in the city to the big hotels and that becomes the price that the bars or the smaller restaurants would pay.

We have looked at materials, we have looked at documents, there's confidentiality and cross orders. I'm not to disclose what those say except to say we stand before the Court and assert that theory with respect to this claim.

There was a rigged-bid price, that is the price that becomes

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Robert L. Smith, Official Court Reporter of
4	the United States District Court, Eastern District of
5	Michigan, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28,
6	United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the
7	foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcript
8	taken in the matter of In re: Autmotive Parts Antitrust
9	Litigation, Case No. 12-md-02311, on Wednesday,
10	November 13, 2013.
11	
12	
13	s/Robert L. Smith Robert L. Smith, RPR, CSR 5098
14	Federal Official Court Reporter United States District Court
15	Eastern District of Michigan
16	
17	
18	Date: 12/02/2013
19	Detroit, Michigan
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	I